

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 1404-03
Bill No.: HCS for HB 880
Subject: Natural Resources Department; Boards, Commissions, Committees, Councils;
Agriculture Department; Insurance Department; Surveyors; Parks and Recreation;
Waste - Solid; Water Resources and Water Districts
Type: Original
Date: April 26, 2013

Bill Summary: This proposal changes the laws regarding natural resources.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
General Revenue*	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0

* transfer of revenue and expenditures from the Department of Natural Resources to the Department of Agriculture

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Land Survey*	\$0	\$0	\$0
Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

* transfer of revenue and expenditures from the Department of Natural Resources to the Department of Agriculture

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 20 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Department of Agriculture	11 FTE	11 FTE	11 FTE
Department of Insurance	2 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE
Department of Natural Resources	(13 FTE)	(13 FTE)	(13 FTE)
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0 FTE	0 FTE	0 FTE

☐ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).

☐ Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

§ 43.543 - Fingerprinting:

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources (DNR)** state this part of the proposal provides a process for the department to check the person's criminal history through the Missouri State Highway Patrol's Missouri Criminal Records Repository and the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Federal Criminal History Files, if needed.

Oversight assumes the Missouri State Highway Patrol (MHP) receives an appropriation within its annual budget, to collect fingerprints for the purpose of completing background checks and checking the criminal history; from other state agencies. **Oversight** assumes this provision would result in no direct fiscal impact to DNR or MHP.

§§ 60.510 - 60.670 Land Survey Program:

Officials from DNR responded as follows:

DNR states § 65.510, would make the Department of Agriculture (AGR) responsible for the land survey functions, duties and responsibilities rather than the Department of Natural Resources.

DNR states § 60.530, would make the state land surveyor reportable to AGR rather than the DNR, including all functions and duties as prescribed in §§ 60.510 to 60.610.

DNR states § 60.570, would remove liability from the Land Survey Program, of rent or any other costs associated with office space if the headquarters are located in any building owned by a state agency or department.

Oversight assumes § 60.670, requires if the Land Survey Program is located in any building owned by a state agency or department, the program would not be liable for rent or any other costs related to the office space. This section of the proposal also requires the building with the permanent headquarters of the Land Survey Program to be named the “Robert E. Myers Building”.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

DNR notes, with the 1974 reorganization of state government, the Land Survey Program was established within the Division of Geology and Land Survey and was required to be located near the office of the state geologist because of shared interests in accurate maintenance of the land corners and geodetic markers that form the basis of property ownership within Missouri.

DNR states, § 60.570, RSMo, requires the land survey program to be located near the state geological survey. The changes to § 60.570 indicate that if the land survey program headquarters are located in any building owned by a state agency or department, the land survey program shall not be liable to that agency or department for rent or any other costs associated with the office space.

DNR assumed this refers to current office furniture and cubicles. Should the Land Survey Program remain in DNR owned facilities, AGR will pay the costs associated with occupying the space including, but not limited to, rent, utilities, maintenance and repair or renovations initiated by AGR.

Oversight assumes should the Land Survey Program remain in a DNR owned facility or be placed in another state agency facility, after the duties have been transferred to AGR. AGR would not be liable to DNR, or any other state agency, for rent, or any other costs associated with the office space used by AGR for the Land Survey Program.

DNR states § 60.595, would change the name of the Department of Natural Resources Revolving Fund to the Department of Agriculture Revolving Services Fund. Administrative duties for the fund would also transfer to AGR, rather than DNR, including fund income and expenditure reporting. As of January 31, 2013, the Land Survey portion of the Revolving Services Fund had a cash balance of \$314,912 and a FY 14 expense and equipment allocation of \$80,000.

DNR states §60.620 would transfer the creation of the Land Survey Committee to within AGR, rather than DNR.

DNR states §60.670 would make AGR responsible for the promulgation of rules and regulations for digital cadastral parcel mapping, rather than DNR.

DNR notes, the Land Survey Authority was created by statute in 1969 and supported by a \$1 recording fee collected by the offices of county recorders of deeds. This fee remains unchanged to this day.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

DNR assumes the current program staffing levels of 11 FTE, \$439,477 of personal services plus pay plan, \$223,143 fringe and \$72,100 of Expense & Equipment planned spending plus \$180,000 Program Specific Distribution appropriation authority would transfer to AGR. DNR assumes AGR will become responsible for the Missouri Land Survey Fund.

DNR notes, the land survey program supports .50 FTE for AOSA receptionist duties and .50 FTE of a laborer II who performs janitorial/maintenance work in support of the office space currently occupied by the land survey program. These duties will remain within DNR due to the size of the building supported and should not transfer to the Department of Agriculture. The department assumes a general revenue request will be made to replace the funding for staff previously supported by the Land Survey Fees.

DNR states there are two employees within the Division of State Parks (DSP) who conduct surveys of State Parks' boundaries and are supervised by staff within the Land Survey Program. DNR assumes that staff within the Land Survey Program would continue to work with State Parks as it relates to State Parks boundary surveys.

DNR states the Natural Resources Revolving Services Fund (RSF) is used for a number of purposes other than the purchase of goods or services for reproducing land survey documents for distribution. DNR is allowed to publish maps and publications for resale as well as simplify funding for inter-divisional cooperative agreements such as for laboratory services, core library fees, workshops, conferences, and other central services. Revenue, expenditures and cash balances are tracked separately for each of the activities utilizing the RSF.

DNR assumes only the appropriation and cash associated with land survey activities within the Revolving Services Fund would be utilized by the Department of Agriculture.

DNR assumes the RSF would continue to be utilized by DNR for all existing RSF activities (i.e. no change for DNR) until such time as a new revolving services fund can be established for DNR

DNR assumes appropriation, FTE, and cash balances attributable to activities not related to the Land Survey Program will transfer to DNR's newly established revolving services fund.

Oversight assumes any costs incurred by the Department of Agriculture to implement this proposal would be offset by decreases in costs at the Department of Natural Resources.

Oversight will use the net fiscal impact provided by the Department of Natural Resources for the Land Survey Program.

KB:LR:OD

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§ 192.300 - Local Health Board Ordinances, Rules, Orders, and Regulations:

In response to HCS for HB for 927 the following responses were received:

Officials from the **Randolph County Health Department (RCHD)** stated this section of the proposal gives authority for local health boards to enact ordinances, rules, orders, and regulations.

RCHD stated the County Commission could decide to rescind the local fee ordinance for the health department and this would result in a one year loss of \$9,010 for sewage permit fees, \$6,831 for food handler permits, and \$12,995 for food establishment licenses.

RCHD stated under current law, the local health board sets these fees and if rescinded by the County Commission, there would be no way to set an order, rule, regulation, or ordinance to issue permits and collect fees. The RCHD could lose a minimum of \$29,000 from these activities.

Officials from the **Clay County Public Health Center (CCPHC)** stated that if the County Commission is not supportive of any ordinances, rules, orders, regulations, the health department will not be able to regulate issues that impact the health of the public. Programs that ensure food safety, water quality and safety, and proper disposal of human waste through sewage disposal systems are currently operated by CCPHC. These programs would be adversely affected, both in terms of management and ability of CCPHC to generate funding support for those public safety activities.

CCPHC stated this section of the proposal could negatively impact the annual operating budget by eliminating \$152,000 each budget year in the following manor:

1. Food Protection Program - \$125,000 annually
2. Private Sewage Disposal system Program - \$16,000 annually
3. Pool Safety Program - \$11,000 annually

Officials from the **Henry County Health Center** assumed this section of the proposal would have a negative fiscal impact on the health center.

Oversight assumes this section requires counties with both a county commission and a county health center board to be in agreement with any order, ordinance, rule, or regulation related to fees.

KB:LR:OD

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes any current fees would remain in place unless both the County Commission and the County Health Center Board are in agreement to rescind those fees and any new fees or fee increases would be required to be approved by both the County Commission and the County Health Center Board. This section of the proposal would result in no direct fiscal impact to local health departments.

§ 253.090 - State Park Earnings Fund:

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal relates to the deposit of moneys into the “State Park Earnings Fund” and any interest earned being credited to the fund.

Oversight assumes this section will not result in any direct fiscal impact to state or local government funds.

§ 260.247 - Solid Waste Collection Services:

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal requires the cities of Blue Springs and Florissant, if the city intends to expand solid waste collection services into an area where collection services are provided by one or more entities, to put the expansion of collection services to a vote of the people where these services would be expanded.

Oversight assumes this vote would occur at a regularly scheduled local election and not require a local special election.

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal will not result in a direct fiscal impact to the cities of Blue Springs and Florissant.

§§ 260.390 and 260.395 - Hazardous Waste Facilities:

DNR states this part of the proposal would eliminate the requirement for the Department to conduct a habitual violator review before issuing a permit for a hazardous waste facility.

DNR assumes this part of the proposal would eliminate the requirement for the Department to issue a post-closure permit to hazardous waste facilities to address required actions upon closure of a permitted hazardous waste facility.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

DNR assumes this part of the proposal would eliminate the requirement for applicants for hazardous waste permits to submit a health profile along with their application.

DNR assumes this part of the proposal would eliminate the requirement for DNR to conduct a five-year review of permits issued to hazardous waste land disposal facilities.

DNR assumes deleting section 260.434 would eliminate the requirement for the Department to assess the transportation system serving the area of applicants for hazardous waste permits.

DNR assumes with department staff no longer having to commit time and resources to conduct the reviews that are proposed to be eliminated in this section, DNR would see an improvement in the efficiency of reviewing and issuing permits.

DNR assumes facilities would continue to see the cost savings in future years as a result of no longer having to complete the activities that are proposed to be deleted. The range of cost savings to each facility cannot reasonably be estimated at this time.

DNR assumes any savings would be largely based on the location (demographics in the vicinity) of the facility and the complexity (or lack thereof) of the facility's hazardous waste operations.

Oversight assumes this part of the proposal could result in future savings to DNR due to increased efficiencies, but for the purpose of the fiscal note, **Oversight** will assume this section will have no direct fiscal impact on DNR.

§§ 319.129, 319.130 and 319.132 - Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund:

In response to similar legislation from this year, **Oversight** received the following responses:

Officials from the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration (DIFP)** assume this proposal adds the director of DIFP to the board of trustees for the Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund. DIFP states the proposal transfers the Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund (PSTIF) and the board of trustees from DNR (HB 6) to the DIFP (HB 7). For FY2013 DNR has an appropriation of \$22,302,601 and 2.0 FTE to fund the board of trustees, general administration and operation of the fund. DIFP believes this appropriation will be transferred out of HB 6 (DNR's budget) and into HB 7 (DIFP's budget).

ASSUMPTION (continued)

DIFP states section 319.129(9), provides staff resources for the Missouri Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund. The staff resources requested by the Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund of the department are not known. After the board and the department agree upon the services to be provided to the board by the department, appropriation and FTE will be requested through the budget process. There will be an unknown fiscal impact to the department.

Officials from the **Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund (PSTIF)** assume this proposal deletes section 319.130, which gives the PSTIF Board of Trustees responsibility for implementing a federally-mandated training program for operators of underground tanks. This would eliminate the PSTIF Board's costs to implement this program, which were estimated in the fiscal note for SB135, enacted in 2011. The proposal could result in the loss of federal funds to the DNR.

PSTIF assumes a savings to the fund as a result of the elimination of the Operator Training Program; the program is currently in development and actual costs are unknown.

PSTIF states costs for personnel to communicate and coordinate with DIFP to set up new administrative procedures and relationships for accounting, auditing, budgeting, mailroom, legislative and IT functions are unknown; it is assumed current personnel would be utilized for these duties and would simply have to adjust their workload to accommodate these one-time tasks.

PSTIF software is maintained by a third-party administrator under an existing contract; software revisions would be done by the existing contractor.

PSTIF assumes the proposal grants authority to the Hazardous Waste Management Commission to raise hazardous waste fees in the future, with no cap and no sunset date. This could cost the PSTIF additional funds, as tank owners who remove their tank systems and/or who clean up leaks must often pay hazardous waste fees as part of their cleanup; some of these fees are then included in claims made to the PSTIF for reimbursement.

PSTIF states there is no way to know whether the fees would increase in the future, when they might increase, or by how much.

DNR assumes these sections move the PSTIF from DNR to DIFP. The Hazardous Waste Program receives funding from PSTIF and has contracts with PSTIF for activities related to underground storage tanks.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

DNR assumes that the department would still have the authority to enter into contracts with PSTIF and to receive funding from PSTIF for these services as "another state agency" under the terms of section 319.129.

DNR states the requirements for a state's operator training program are found in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Grant Guidelines for Implementing the Operator Training Provision of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, August 2007 (federal guidelines).

DNR assumes without an operator training program, EPA will have justification to revoke the approval of Missouri's underground storage tank program.

Oversight assumes PSTIF could absorb any potential IT costs related to this proposal as part of the existing contract with the third-party administrator.

Oversight assumes this substitute did not delete Section 319.130. Therefore, Oversight will not reflect a savings for the training program.

Oversight assumes any costs incurred by the Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration to implement this proposal would be offset by decreases in costs at the Department of Natural Resources.

Oversight will use the net fiscal impact provided by the Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration for the PSTIF.

§ 537.556 - Underground Hard Rock Mining or Hard Rock Milling Civil Actions:

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal is similar to HB 975 (2013), related to underground hard rock mining or hard rock milling civil actions.

In response to a similar proposal HB 975 (2013), officials from the **Department of Natural Resources, Department of Health and Senior Services, Office of State Courts Administrator, and Office of the Attorney General** each assumed this section of the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§ 640.065 - Department of Natural Resources Revolving Services Fund:

DNR states section 640.065 creates the DNR revolving services fund within DNR. The creation of the fund in section 640.065, while new to section 640.065, is not a new fund to the department. The Land Survey Program currently utilizes the DNR revolving services fund for activities that will transfer to the AGR in the proposed legislation. The Natural Resources Revolving Services Fund (RSF) is used for a number of purposes other than the purchase of goods or services for reproducing land survey documents for distribution.

DNR states DNR is allowed to publish maps and publications for resale as well as simplify funding for inter-divisional cooperative agreements such as for laboratory services, core library fees, workshops, conferences, and other central services. Revenue, expenditures and cash balances are tracked separately for each of the activities utilizing the DNR Revolving Services Fund. No fiscal impact is anticipated by the department as a result of the proposed legislation.

Officials from the **State Treasurer's Office (STO)** state this section will require a new FTE for the STO to physically watch every transaction in the DNR Revolving Services Fund since the changes to section 640.065, require the STO to approve all disbursements from the fund. The STO does not currently have a dedicated FTE to solely watch the fund.

Oversight assumes the STO is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year.

Oversight assumes STO could absorb the costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs STO could request funding through the appropriation process.

§ 640.080 - E. Coli Testing at Missouri Beaches:

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal relates to sampling and testing measures for E. Coli at Missouri beaches. This section requires signs posted at Missouri beaches to state, "Swimming is Not Recommended", if Missouri beaches exceed the GM standard established by the amendment. DNR has the right to close the beach if a health risk is found.

Oversight assumes any costs resulting from this amendment to DNR could be absorbed and this section of the proposal will not change the direct fiscal impact of the proposal.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§ 640.230 - Donation of Land or Property Rights:

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal relates to the donation of land or other property rights donated to the State of Missouri. To determine the economic benefits of any land or other property rights donated to the State of Missouri, the trustee will include any fees and other revenues by the State of Missouri as well as indirect economic benefits to the State of Missouri including spending, economic multiplier effects, jobs, and the ecological benefits of the donated land

Oversight assumes the changes from this section of the proposal could result in a change in the assessed value of donated land and property rights given to the state of Missouri.

Oversight assumes any fiscal impact from this section would be indirect and dependent on donations of land and property rights to the State of Missouri. Therefore, for the purpose of the fiscal note, **Oversight** assumes this section of the proposal will have no direct fiscal impact on state or local government funds.

§ 643.079 - Clean Air Fees:

DNR states the Air Pollution Control Program has several fee rates that are not sufficient enough to cover the reasonable cost of day to day business. This part of the proposal continues DNR's authority to work with stakeholders and the commission to recommend an adjusted fee structure. DNR would not anticipate a direct fiscal impact from this provision of the proposal.

§ 644.029 - Water Quality Standards:

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal relates to compliance schedules for permittees to make upgrades or changes to meet any new water quality standard established by DNR. DNR is required to give permittees an appropriate schedule of compliance, incorporate new water quality requirements into existing permits at the time of renewal, and all new permittees must meet any new standards or classifications prescribed by DNR.

In response to a similar proposal from this year (HB 944), officials from the **Department of Natural Resources (DNR)** assumed this proposal could prevent DNR from administering the provisions of the federal Clean Water Act.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

DNR stated the proposal could impact the department's ability to implement new water quality standards through permits.

DNR was unable to determine a fiscal impact from this proposal.

Oversight assumes existing permittees may make changes and upgrades as funding becomes available or at the time of permit renewal to meet any new water quality standards prescribed by DNR. Any new permittees may be required to meet any new water quality standards prescribed by DNR.

Oversight assumes any direct fiscal impact from this section of the proposal is dependent upon action being taken by the permittee and DNR.

Therefore, for the purpose of the fiscal note, **Oversight** will assume no direct fiscal impact from this section of the proposal.

§ 644.057 - Clean Water Commission:

DNR state this section of the proposal gives the commission the authority to recommend revisions to the clean water fee structure. If voted and approved by the commission the commission would promulgate and publish the clean water fee structure by December thirty-first of the same year beginning December 31, 2013. If the rules are not disapproved by the General Assembly they would take effect January 1 of the next odd-numbered year.

Oversight assumes this part of the proposal would have no direct fiscal impact to DNR.

§ 1- Division of State Parks Stakeholder Meetings:

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal requires the Department of Natural Resources - Division of State Parks (DSP) each year to hold a stakeholder meeting in each park district.

Oversight assumes any costs related to holding stakeholder meetings and responding to area stakeholders could be absorbed by DSP.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§ 2 - Documents used for Permits:

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal requires the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), beginning December 1, 2013, and annually thereafter to develop a list of all documents DNR uses to determine the issuance or permits, certifications, or modifications under state statute, state or federal agencies. The list is required to be submitted to the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules for review.

Oversight assumes the changes from this section of the proposal will not result in any direct fiscal impact.

§ 3 - Mining Permits Near an Accredited School:

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal modifies the provisions of section 444.771 related to limitations on mining permits near an accredited school. This section of the proposal exempts the City of Jackson from this prohibition.

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal could have an indirect fiscal impact on the City of Jackson and small businesses in the City of Jackson, but would require action by an underground mining operation whose mine plan boundary is within one thousand feet of any real property where an accredited school has been located for at least five years prior to the application for permit.

For the purpose of the fiscal note, **Oversight** will assume the changes from this amendment will not result in any change to the direct fiscal impact of this proposal.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Bill as a Whole:

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** state many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The SOS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the SOS also recognizes that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what the office can sustain with the core budget. Therefore, the SOS reserves the right to request funding for the cost of supporting administrative rules requirements should the need arise based on a review of the finally approved bills signed by the governor.

Oversight assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process.

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, Missouri State University, Office of Administration, Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol, City of Kansas City, City of Columbia, and Office of Governor** each assume the current proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture** defer to Department of Natural Resources's fiscal estimates regarding the Land Survey Program.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
GENERAL REVENUE			
<u>Transfer In - AGR - § 60.510 - Land</u> Survey Program			
Salaries	(\$23,695)	(\$28,718)	(\$29,006)
Fringes	(\$12,024)	(\$14,573)	(\$14,719)
<u>Total Revenue - AGR</u>	(\$35,719)	(\$43,291)	(\$43,725)
FTE Change - AGR	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
<u>Transfer Out - DNR - § 60.510 - Land</u> Survey Program			
Salaries	\$23,695	\$28,718	\$29,006
Fringes	\$12,024	\$14,573	\$14,719
<u>Total Costs - DNR</u>	\$35,719	\$43,291	\$43,725
FTE Change - DNR	(1 FTE)	(1 FTE)	(1 FTE)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change for the General Revenue Fund	0 FTE	0 FTE	0 FTE

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government
 (continued)

FY 2014
 (10 Mo.)

FY 2015

FY 2016

LAND SURVEY FUND

Transfer In - AGR - § 60.510 - Land
 Survey Program

Salaries	(\$439,777)	(\$439,777)	(\$439,777)
Fringes	(\$223,143)	(\$223,143)	(\$223,143)
Equipment & Expense	(\$72,100)	(\$72,100)	(\$72,100)
Other Fund Costs	<u>(\$180,000)</u>	<u>(\$180,000)</u>	<u>(\$180,000)</u>
<u>Total Revenue - AGR</u>	<u>(\$915,020)</u>	<u>(\$915,020)</u>	<u>(\$915,020)</u>
FTE Change - AGR	11 FTE	11 FTE	11 FTE

Transfer Out - DNR - § 60.510 - Land
 Survey Program

Salaries	\$439,777	\$439,777	\$439,777
Fringes	\$223,143	\$223,143	\$223,143
Equipment & Expense	\$72,100	\$72,100	\$72,100
Other Fund Costs	<u>\$180,000</u>	<u>\$180,000</u>	<u>\$180,000</u>
<u>Total Costs - DNR</u>	<u>\$915,020</u>	<u>\$915,020</u>	<u>\$915,020</u>
FTE Change - DNR	(11 FTE)	(11 FTE)	(11 FTE)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON
LAND SURVEY FUND

\$0

\$0

\$0

Estimated Net FTE Change for the Land
 Survey Fund

0 FTE

0 FTE

0 FTE

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u> (continued)	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
--	---------------------	---------	---------

**PETROLEUM STORAGE TANK
 INSURANCE FUND**

Transfer In - DIFP

§ 319.129 - Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund Program	(\$22,302,601)	(\$22,302,601)	(\$22,302,601)
FTE Change - DIFP	2 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE

Transfer Out - DNR

§ 319.129 - Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund program	<u>\$22,302,601</u>	<u>\$22,302,601</u>	<u>\$22,302,601</u>
FTE Change - DNR	(2 FTE)	(2 FTE)	(2 FTE)

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE
 PETROLEUM STORAGE TANK
 INSURANCE FUND**

	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change for the Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund	0 FTE	0 FTE	0 FTE

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

§§ 319.129, 319.130 and 319.132 - Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund:

PSTIF assumes the elimination of the Operator Training program could result in the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) withdrawing its approval of Missouri's regulatory program for underground storage tanks and instead require the implementation of the EPA's federal and program. This could have a negative impact on tank owners/operators, the majority of which are considered small businesses.

This section of the proposal would allow the Hazardous Waste Management Commission to increase hazardous waste fees in the future. Many of these fees are paid by small businesses.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

§§ 60.510 - 60.670 Land Survey Program:

This proposal transfers all powers, duties, and functions of the Land Survey Program within the Department of Natural Resources to the Department of Agriculture.

§§ 319.129, 319.130, 319.132 - Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund:

This proposal transfers the Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund and the board of trustees from the Department of Natural Resources to the Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions, and Professional Registration.

This proposal includes an emergency clause for section 644.057.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Natural Resources
Department of Agriculture
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration
Department of Health and Senior Services
Office of State Courts Administrator
Office of the Attorney General
State Treasurer's Office
Office of Secretary of State
Office of Administration
Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol
Office of Governor
Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Missouri State University
City of Kansas City
City of Columbia
Randolph County Health Department
Clay County Public Health Center
Henry County Health Center



Ross Strobe
Acting Director
April 26, 2013